



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/621,902	07/17/2003	David Yu Chang	AUS920030082US1	2139

65362 7590 06/18/2007
INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES CORPORATION
c/o HAMILTON & TERRILE, LLP
P.O. BOX 203518
AUSTIN, TX 78720

EXAMINER

CAO, PHUONG THAO

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2164

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/18/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/621,902	CHANG ET AL.
	Examiner Phuong-Thao Cao	Art Unit 2164

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 April 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,3-9,11-17 and 19-24 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,3-9,11-17 and 19-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.


SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to Amendment filed on 4/5/2007.
2. Claims 1, 7, 9, 15, 17 and 23 have been amended. Currently, claims 1, 3-9, 11-17 and 19-24 are pending.

Response to Amendment

3. Amendment to the Specification is effective to overcome the objection to the Specification stated in the previous office action. Therefore, the objection has been withdrawn.
4. Amendments to the claims are effective to overcome the 35 U.S.C 112 rejection and the 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection stated in the previous office action. Therefore, the 112 and 101 rejections have been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an

international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1, 3-9, 11-17 and 19-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lango et al. (US Patent No 6,813,690, effective date 10/16/2001).

As to claim 1, Lango et al. teaches:

“A method for processing names by a naming service within a data processing system” (see Lango et al., Abstract and Fig. 6), the method comprising:

“obtaining an application name that is associated with an application” (see Lango et al., [column 9, lines 20-60] for obtaining a URL wherein media data which can be executable files or applications [column 2, line 1] and URL associated with an executable file which is used to identify the executable file in the caching system can be considered as Applicant’s “application name”);

“obtaining a deployment name that is associated with a deployment attribute that characterizes a deployment of an instance of the application” (see Lango et al., [column 12, lines 58-67] and [column 13, lines 1-10] for obtaining validator string which uniquely identifies a deployment of media data associated with a URL (application), so validator string can be interpreted as deployment name; in addition, validator string is associated with media data attribute such as version information, author information,etc., which characterized a deployment of each version of media data wherein each version of media data is equivalent to Applicant’s “instance of the application”);

“generating an application-based name for the instance of the application” (see Lango et al., Fig. 3, item 308 and Fig. 4 [column 12, lines 10-67] and [column 16, lines 1-25] for generating object name string wherein object name string is equivalent to Applicant’s “application-based name”; also see [column 19, lines 7-55]); and

“storing the application-based name for the instance of the application in a computer storage medium” (see Lango et al., [column 3, lines 27-32] for storing the generated object names (identifiers)),

“wherein the application-based name represents a context within a naming system, the application-based name is a compound name that comprises the application name and the deployment name” (see Fig. 4 and [column 19, lines 7-55]); and

“the deployment attribute is a metadata value that characterizes a manner in which the instance of the application is deployed within the data processing system” (see [column 12, lines 40-50 and 57-65], [column 13, lines 1-25] and [column 19, lines 35-55]).

As to claim 9, Lango et al. teaches:

“An apparatus for processing names by a naming service within a data processing system” (see Lango et al., Abstract and Fig. 6), the apparatus comprising:

“means for obtaining an application name that is associated with an application” (see Lango et al., [column 9, lines 20-60] for obtaining a URL wherein media data which can be executable files or applications [column 2, line 1] and URL associated with an executable file which is used to identify the executable file in the caching system can be considered as Applicant’s “application name”);

“means for obtaining a deployment name that is associated with a deployment attribute that characterizes a deployment of an instance of the application” (see Lango et al., [column 12, lines 58-67] and [column 13, lines 1-10] for obtaining validator string which uniquely identifies a deployment of media data associated with a URL (application), so validator string can be interpreted as deployment name; in addition, validator string is associated with media data attribute such as version information, author information, etc., which characterized a deployment of each version of media data wherein each version of media data is equivalent to Applicant’s “instance of the application”);

“means for generating an application-based name for the instance of the application” (see Lango et al., Fig. 3, item 308 and Fig. 4 [column 12, lines 10-67] and [column 16, lines 1-25] for generating object name string wherein object name string is equivalent to Applicant’s “application-based name”; also see [column 19, lines 7-55]); and

“means for storing the application-based name for the instance of the application in a computer storage medium” (see Lango et al., [column 3, lines 27-32] for storing the generated object names (identifiers)),

“wherein the application-based name represents a context within a naming system, the application-based name is a compound name that comprises the application name and the deployment name” (see Lango et al., Fig. 4 and [column 19, lines 7-55]); and

“the deployment attribute is a metadata value that characterizes a manner in which the instance of the application is deployed within the data processing system” (see Lango et al., [column 12, lines 40-50 and 57-65], [column 13, lines 1-25] and [column 19, lines 35-55]).

As to claim 17, Lango et al. teaches:

“A computer program product in a computer storage medium for use in a data processing system for processing names by a naming service” (see Abstract and Fig. 6), the computer program product comprising:

“means for obtaining an application name that is associated with an application” (see Lango et al., [column 9, lines 20-60] for obtaining a URL wherein media data which can be executable files or applications [column 2, line 1] and URL associated with an executable file which is used to identify the executable file in the caching system can be considered as Applicant’s “application name”);

“means for obtaining a deployment name that is associated with a deployment attribute that characterizes a deployment of an instance of the application” (see Lango et al., [column 12, lines 58-67] and [column 13, lines 1-10] for obtaining validator string which uniquely identifies a deployment of media data associated with a URL (application), so validator string can be interpreted as deployment name; in addition, validator string is associated with media data attribute such as version information, author information,etc., which characterized a deployment of each version of media data wherein each version of media data is equivalent to Applicant’s “instance of the application”); and

“means for generating an application-based name for the instance of the application” (see Lango et al., Fig. 3, item 308 and Fig. 4, [column 12, lines 10-67] and [column 16, lines 1-25] for generating object name string wherein object name string is equivalent to Applicant’s “application-based name”; also see [column 19, lines 7-55]),

“wherein the application-based name represents a context within a naming system, the application-based name is a compound name that comprises the application name and the deployment name” (see Lango et al., Fig. 4 and [column 19, lines 7-55]); and

“the deployment attribute is a metadata value that characterizes a manner in which the instance of the application is deployed within the data processing system” (see Lango et al., [column 12, lines 40-50 and 57-65], [column 13, lines 1-25] and [column 19, lines 35-55]).

As to claims 3, 11 and 19, these claims are rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claims 1, 9 and 17 respectively, and are similarly rejected including the following:

Lango et al. teaches:

“wherein the application-based name comprises the application name and multiple deployment names associated with multiple deployment attributes” (see Lango et al., [column 19, lines 40-45] wherein URL is application name and English/MSIE are multiple deployment names associated with multiple deployment attributes such as language/browser type).

As to claims 4, 12 and 20, these claims are rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claims 1, 9 and 17 respectively, and are similarly rejected including the following:

Lango et al. teaches:

“wherein a deployment attribute is selected from the group comprising” (see Lango et al., [column 19, lines 20-55] for metadata is equivalent to Applicant’s “deployment attribute”):

“a deployment identifier, wherein a deployment identifier is a unique identifier associated with the deployment operation, wherein the deployment identifier is unique over all deployment operations for all instances of the application within the data processing system; a version identifier or an edition identifier associated with a version of the application; or some other identifier for a deployment-associated characteristic or metric” (see Lango et al., [column 10, lines 1-30], [column 13, lines 1-25], [column 15, lines 30-40] and [column 19, lines 7-55]).

As to claims 5, 13 and 21, these claims are rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claims 1, 9 and 17 respectively, and are similarly rejected including the following:

Lango et al. teaches:

“binding the application-based name to a data object” (see Lango et al., Fig. 3 and [column 6, lines 25-40]).

As to claims 6, 14 and 22, these claims are rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claims 5, 13 and 21 respectively, and are similarly rejected including the following:

Lango et al. teaches:

“relating the data object to a context for an application server” (see Lango et al., Fig. 5 and [column 6, lines 15-25] wherein caching server is equivalent to Applicant’s “application server” and object handle is equivalent to Applicant’s “context”).

As to claims 7, 15 and 23, these claims are rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claims 5, 13 and 21 respectively, and are similarly rejected including the following:

Lango et al. teaches:

“resolving the application-based name to a previously bound data object” (Lango et al., Fig. 6, [column 6, lines 15-25] and [column 13, lines 50-67]).

As to claims 8, 16 and 24, these claims are rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claims 1, 9 and 17 respectively, and are similarly rejected including the following:

Lango et al. teaches:

“wherein an application comprises a plurality of application modules wherein each module is associated with a module name and wherein each module is associated with an application-based name based on its module name” (see Lango et al., [column 11, lines 15-65] and [column 12, lines 10-25] wherein each object of the media data is equivalent to Applicant’s “application module” and object number is equivalent to Applicant’s “module name”; also see Fig. 4).

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed on 4/5/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding Applicant's argument that the media data disclosed by Lango et al. is not equivalent to an application as disclosed and claimed by the present invention, Lango et al. teaches in (column 1, lines 65-67 to column 2, lines 1-3) that media data may include executable files which are also called applications.

Regarding Applicant's argument that the information related to various attributes and properties of the media data is not equivalent to the deployment name, Lango et al. discloses information related to various attributes and properties of the media data as media data description information [column 9, lines 36-40] which includes information which uniquely identifies the version or contents of media data [column 13, lines 1-3] associated a URL wherein media data associated with a URL is an application [column 2, line 1], each version of the application represents a deployment of the application and information which uniquely identifies the version can be reasonably considered as identification of the deployment (or deployment name). In addition, the validator string (see [column 12, lines 58-67]-[column 13, lines 1-10]) can also be interpreted as deployment name.

Regarding Applicant's argument that Lango et al. does not teach or suggest a method, an apparatus and computer program product for processing names by a naming service within a data processing system, Lango et al. teaches the caching server as a data processing system [column 3, lines 10-20] which generates object identifiers (names) [Fig. 4] based on application name (i.e., URL), deployment name (i.e., Validator) and uses these generated names to identify and locate objects stored in the caching system.

Applicant is required to point out specific claim limitations that are not taught or suggested by the reference in order to allow Examiner properly address the arguments. For specific teachings of each claimed limitations, see detailed interpretations as provided in the rejection above.

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phuong-Thao Cao whose telephone number is (571) 272-2735. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM (Mon - Fri).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571) 272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.



SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Phuong-Thao Cao
Art Unit 2164
June 1, 2007



SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER